

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 05 2006

LAW OFFICES OF
McGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200

VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817

TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100

FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376

E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM / ADMIN @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SENDER'S E-MAIL: SMCGINN @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN

PHILLIP E. MILLER*

FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER*

JAMES E. HOWARD*

JAMES N. DRESSER

JOHN J. DRESCH

SCOTT M. TULINO

J. BRADLEY WRIGHT*

*MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

May 5, 2006

VIA FACSIMILE
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

To: Examiner Tuan V. Ho
Group Art Unit No. 2622
U. S. P. T. O.

Facsimile No. 571-273-8300

From: Phillip E. Miller

Facsimile No. 703-761-2375

Re: Filing of Statement of Substance of Interview
U. S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/811,464
Our Ref: MAS.008

Dear Examiner:

Enclosed please find a Statement of Substance of Interview regarding the Interview conducted via telephone on March 13, 2006.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration of this case.

Very truly yours,



Phillip E. Miller

PEM/rap
Enclosure

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Tsuneo Sato et al.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 05 2006

Serial No.: 09/811,464 Group Art Unit: 2615


Filed: March 20, 2001 Examiner: Tuan V. Ho

For: ELECTRONIC CAMERA, INFORMATION OBTAINING SYSTEM AND PRINT
ORDER SYSTEMHonorable Commissioner of Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Sir:

Applicant provides herewith his Statement of Substance of the telephone interview which was conducted between the Examiner and Applicant on March 13, 2006.

1. **Brief description of nature of exhibits/demonstrations:** N/A
2. **Claims discussed:** 19, 20
3. **Prior art discussed:** Kimoto(U. S. Pat. 6,115,611), Squilla (U. S. Pat. 6,396,537)
4. **Proposed amendments discussed:** ,
The Examiner stated that he intended to reject claim 19 as obvious over the combination of Kimoto et al. (not previously cited) in view of Squilla. The Examiner stated that cols. 16-17 are the pertinent portions of Kimota.
5. **Arguments made by Applicant's representative:** In response to the Examiner's comments, Applicant tentatively proposed instead of canceling claim 19, merging claim 20 into claim 19 which would make claim 19 include similar elements as allowable claim 1. However, the Examiner stated that the preamble of claim 1 would need to be added to allow claim 19 and, thus, he would not agree to allow claim 19 based on Applicant's proposal.
6. **Other pertinent matters:** N/A
7. **Result of Interview:** No agreement was reached.

Date: 5/5/06Respectfully Submitted,
Phillip E. Miller
Reg. No. 46,060


McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

Serial No.: 09/811,464
MAS.008

2

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed by facsimile with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Examiner Tuan V. Ho, Group Art Unit # 2622 at fax number 571-273-8300 this 5th day of May, 2006.


Phillip E. Miller
Reg. No. 46,060